

Talking Points

New PFIAB Study ON NRO

252
3/14

14 MAR 1984

Concerns:

- McFarlane memo notes SecDef/DCI "agreement on an approach for resolving differences." What is it?
- How do you envision the results of the new PFIAB study getting to the President as a "joint PFIAB/DoD/DCI report"?

We Propose:

- The PFIAB Task Force would identify and clarify the specific issues addressed by its January report so that we fully understand them.
- The DoD and DCI would then review the issues and problems identified and provide our findings to the Task Force. To adequately conduct this review, we would request approximately 60 days.
- We could then mutually attempt to resolve with the PFIAB any issues that might remain based on our findings.
- A TOR for the "joint study" which would include the above 3 points and ensure DCI and DoD participation in the study report writing group.

Page Denied

~~SECRET~~

5 March 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Intelligence Community Staff

25X1

VIA: Deputy Director, Intelligence Community Staff

FROM:
Acting Director, Planning and Policy Staff

25X1

SUBJECT: PFIAB Report on the NRO

1. The attached unexpected memorandum from Ambassador McFarlane states that the DCI, SecDef and the Chairman of the PFIAB have reached agreement on an approach for resolving the areas of disagreement over the PFIAB report on the NRO. The memorandum charges the PFIAB to begin immediately to resolve the issues raised by the report and that a joint PFIAB/DoD/DCI report be submitted to the President not later than 30 June 1984 which identifies resolved and outstanding issues.

25X1

2. During the week of 21 February, the PFIAB Staff informed the NRO Staff that the DCI and SecDef had agreed to have the PFIAB reexamine the functions, responsibilities and management of the National Reconnaissance Office between now and the end of June 1984. The composition of this agreement, which is apparently the one referenced by Ambassador McFarlane, is unknown to us.

25X1

3. I am concerned about the process the PFIAB Staff reports will be used to conduct the review. The PFIAB has established a Task Force composed of Dr. Foster, Dr. Wheelon, Ambassador Weiss, Dr. Baker, Dr. Rechten, and Dr. Flax to begin the review the week of 6 March 1984. The PFIAB Staff informed the NRO Staff that they intend to determine where agreement or disagreement exists on the content of the previous report, identify what old or new subjects should be discussed or expanded, and then provide a new report based on the results of these reviews to the President by 30 June 1984. No mention was made of how the final report will become a ". . . joint PFIAB/DoD/DCI . . ." report.

25X1

4. Our concern with the approach reported to be used by the PFIAB is that it will not permit the DCI and SecDef to adequately respond to the existing PFIAB report. We have so far been unable to determine the specific problems

25X1

WARNING NOTICE
INTELLIGENCE SOURCES

SECRET

that the PFIAB believes actually exist or the specific rationale behind the content of the report. Their approach also makes no mention of the joint report to be produced and how this will happen. Prior to Ambassador McFarlane's memorandum, the NRO Staff suggested to Mr. Aldridge what I believe to be a good approach to resolving our basic concerns with the PFIAB process. The suggested approach is for the DCI and SecDef to champion the following two-phase study process to Ms. Armstrong:

- a. The PFIAB Task Force would identify and clarify the specific issues addressed by its January report so that we fully understand them.
- b. The DoD and DCI would then review the issues and problems identified and provide our findings to the Task Force. To adequately conduct this review, we would request approximately 60 days.
- c. We could then mutually attempt to resolve with the PFIAB any issues that might remain based on our findings.

25X1

5. Phase One would essentially have the PFIAB Task Force specifically identify the problems they were trying to address in their report but have never clearly explained. This should serve to eliminate any potential misperceptions. Phase Two would require adequate time for us to examine and determine a response to the problems identified by the PFIAB versus simply determining agreement or disagreement on the existing report. Finally, the DCI and SecDef would provide their findings to the PFIAB. This process would then allow the PFIAB Task Force to focus on the substance of any disagreements as opposed to misconceptions or misperceptions that may exist from previous interactions.

25X1


6. With the advent of Ambassador McFarlane's request for a joint study, it seems that we have the latitude to press for a terms of reference (TOR) agreeable to the DCI, SecDef, and the Chairman of the PFIAB. Paragraphs four and five above would be a reasonable basis for the TOR. It would also seem reasonable for the TOR to state that a representative from each of the PFIAB, DUSD(P), PPS and NRO staffs, will jointly prepare the final report for approval by the Principals.

7. The PFIAB Task Force has scheduled the NRO to brief them on 8 March, from 0930 to 1230, on all of the revolutionary ideas and capabilities being pursued by the NRO. The NRO will present a series of revolutionary Reconnaissance Technology concepts that could lead to new programs in response to this request.

25X1

25X1

SECRET

8. While there is no particular reason to raise an issue over the 8 March briefing, I believe that before any other activity related to the joint study takes place, the broader issue should be addressed. To that end, I recommend that you discuss the PFIAB follow-on activity with the DNRO to obtain his views on the PFIAB approach, what role the DCI and SecDef should play, and how a joint report should be produced. ~~I~~ also recommend that you discuss Ambassador McFarlane's memorandum and the need for a formalized TOR with the DCI. 

25X1
25X1

Attachment:



25X1

25X1

SECRET

Subject: PFIAB Report on the NRO

Distribution: [redacted]

1 - D/ICS, w/Attachment	[redacted]	IC Series B, Copy	6
2 - DD/ICS,	"	"	7
3 - AD/PPS,	"	"	8
4 - DD/PPS,	"	"	9
5 - PPS [redacted]	"	"	10
6 - PPS Subj.	"	"	11
7 - PPS Chrono	"	"	12
8 - ICS Registry, w/o attachment			

DCI/ICS/PPS: [redacted] /5 March 1984

mccorm

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

SECRET

NSC/ICS-400096

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SECRET/TALENT-KEYHOLE

February 27, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE CASPAR W. WEINBERGER
The Secretary of Defense

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. CASEY
The Director of Central Intelligence

THE HONORABLE ANNE ARMSTRONG
Chairman
President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board

SUBJECT: PFIAB Report on the National Reconnaissance
Office (NRO) (S/TK)

After careful review of the report by the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) on the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), dated December 23, 1984, and joint comments by the Secretary of Defense and Director of Central Intelligence, dated January 19, 1984, it is obvious that there are several significant areas of disagreement. However, I am pleased that the Chairman of the PFIAB has reached agreement with both the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence on an approach for resolving the differences. (S/TK)

The President concurs with the agreement to charge the PFIAB with the task of resolving those issues raised by the December 23 report. Therefore, I would ask that the PFIAB begin work immediately and that a joint PFIAB/DOD/DCI report be submitted to the President not later than June 30, 1984. The report should identify resolved and outstanding issues addressed by the PFIAB report. (S)

In the interim, the President agrees that periodic informal meetings among the Secretary of Defense, Director of Central Intelligence, and me have the potential for satisfying the main objectives envisioned for an Executive Committee (EXCOM) recommended by the PFIAB. (S)


Robert C. McFarlane

SECRET/TALENT-KEYHOLE

Declassify on: OADR

SECRET

Copy 6 of _____ Copies

IC Series B

25X1